Using Consciousness-Raising to Assist De-Motivated Japanese Students Internalize a Teaching Philosophy and take Ownership of English as an International Language

David McLachlan Jeffrey, Asia University

INTRODUCTION

This paper is an amalgamation of two papers that were written by the author for the CELE Journal Volume Twelve (2004) on the issue of consciousness-raising and another for the CELE Journal Volume Thirteen (2005) on the internalization of English as an international language. It adheres to the spirit of Action Research that promotes learning from experience and through self-evaluation as a teacher. At first, I was not aware of the interconnectedness of these two concepts but having taught at university-level in Japan for several years, I have grown increasingly aware of the need to promote the ownership of English as an International Language (hereafter EIL) as a central part of my teaching philosophy and for students to internalize it.

However, this is an extremely difficult undertaking, particularly in Japan, and it would seem that using consciousness-raising is a way that instills motivation plays an important role in its successful implementation.

This paper begins with an outline of consciousness-raising, internalization and the ownership of EIL, in terms of what they are and why they should be important in English as a Foreign Language (hereafter EFL) teaching. Thereafter factors that prohibit their realization are discussed, such as the general lack of student motivation and student apathy towards English. Finally, some procedures on how consciousness-raising could be implemented to promote internalization and ownership are discussed. These are procedures that I have used and feel that they are quite successful.

Consciousness-raising, if used effectively, can promote the internalization of a teaching philosophy and help students take ownership of English as an International Language. This paper will outline consciousness-raising approaches to help students apprehend the internalization of a teaching philosophy and ownership of EIL. However, it is necessary to define these terms as starting point. It is important to identify why they are important to Japanese students and what the stumbling blocks are that stand in the way to their attaining an understanding of internalization and ownership of EIL prior to examining the practical implementation of consciousness-raising. We now turn to the issue of what comprises consciousness-raising, internalization and ownership of EIL.

CONSCIOUSNESS-RAISING

Consciousness-raising is a psycholinguistic concept related to the widely debated question of how second languages are learned and is specifically concerned with the cognitive question of how students' minds work.

There are many thoughts and approaches on this matter, but Rutherford (1987,151) makes the following interesting observation about second language learning:

> It is incontestable that one cannot learn a language without direct contact with that language. No one could ever learn English, for example, given a vocabulary list and set of rules for syntax, morphology, phonology, etc., no matter how accurate and comprehensive.

Hence, what is required, according to Rutherford (ibid.), is the availability of a "subset" of the formal range of the target language for students, and:

> …from this subset of grammatical properties the student is able to "project" to grammatical phenomena that may not themselves have been present in the data to which he was exposed.

Similarly, Skehan (1998, 64) sees consciousness-raising as 'tasks that draw attention to a particular form, but give no explicit information' and Ellis (1992, p.138) defines it as 'a type of form-focused instruction designed to make learners aware of a specific feature'. Hence Willis (1996, 64) says consciousness-raising occurs when:

> …students are encouraged to notice particular features of the language, to draw conclusions from what they notice and to organize their view of language in the light of the conclusions they have drawn.

The essence of consciousness-raising can hence be found in the interplay between learning and acquisition. This is because whilst language learning refers to the conscious internalization of rules and formulas, language acquisition tends to be unconscious and spontaneous (Krashen: 1987, 1988). Acquisition is similar to the way children learn their mother tongue and there is possibly a fair element of truth in this given the theory of universal-grammar. However Krashen believed that no transfer could happen between the learned and the acquired because of their different inputs. Conversely, Ellis (1982, 76) drawing on Stevick (1980) points out that:

> It may be that communicative opportunity is necessary as the *switch* that starts the flow of learnt to acquired knowledge.

Consciousness-raising would therefore seem to assist in both learning and acquisition in that it relies on some explicit teaching. It uses explicit teaching as a foundation to help students understand and use language features by drawing their attention to them, but cannot end there, as it is essential that students have the communicative opportunity to put into action what they have gained in an explicit manner.

In this way, consciousness-raising makes teaching effective. However, by no means should the explicit side of teaching dominate. Doing so would hinder the automatization of acquisition, as

Cavour (2002, 27) explains:

> While it is true that teaching explicitly certain strategies could strengthen learners' weak areas, it may also hinder the automatization of language acquisition and, in turn, slow down communication, the ultimate purpose of foreign language classes.

This leads to a related consciousness-raising issue, which is the distinction between realistic and real English (Pearse 1983). In Japan, where the explicit approach is mostly used, many students become stuck in the learning phase, applying English as a realistic language, which prohibits consciousness-raising taking effect. Fossilization sets in here at a fairly early age as a result and students come to dislike English as a subject and grow up into adults with a poor English proficiency. For consciousness-raising to work teachers need to close the gap between realistic English (saying something to use English), and real English (using English to say something) by using language learning (formal study) as a springboard for acquisition (spontaneity).

In this way teachers can draw students' attention to prominent characteristics of the target language and let this learning process facilitate acquisition. It is the cognitive capacity of the students that is most important in this respect, rather than mere memorization and regurgitation as in realistic English. Consciousness-raising requires second language acquisition to not be simply the accumulation of one isolated grammatical entity upon another, but rather the acquisition of new language skills upon pre-existing knowledge, through attention to form rather than merely on memorizing details as is the case in many Japanese High schools and 'jukus' (or cram schools). As a result, many of my students have become conditioned over the years to consider English as a subject similar to Mathematics, where the rules of right and wrong apply, whereas I try to convince them that English is more like music or painting.

Consciousness-raising requires salient features of the target language to be isolated and focused upon so that students do not have to know everything about the grammar of a target language in order to speak it. This is important to counter the effects of fossilization, defined by Ellis (1992, 139) as:

> …the process responsible for the cessation of learning some way short of target-language competence.

These salient features then become guidelines allowing students to draw their own conclusions. By doing so, it is the student who discovers it (rather than being drilled in by endless repetition), and the student's retention capacity becomes stronger, as awareness is more acute.

Consciousness-raising is also an invisible process, in that it need not be realized immediately in conversational output, but is, at the same time, also a process making fairly significant changes in the mind of the student. The student begins to remember and understand grammar forms, and through this awareness they become inculcated as part of the overall study process. It also requires the teacher to act more as a facilitator than as a taskmaster.

INTERNALIZATION

Internalization in ELT terminology commonly refers to acquiring the ability to learn or acquire English, but there is little reference to the internalization of teaching philosophies by students as an important part of that ability. It seems that we have to take the word "internalize" one step further in the sense that it becomes an "internalization of internalization".

The Cambridge International Dictionary of English (2002), the word defines "internalize" as:

> To accept or absorb (especially a way of behaving or thinking) as your own, often from repeated experience, so that it becomes a natural and important part of your character.

Using this as a guide, internalization in this paper entails the extent to which the students accept or absorb the teaching philosophy and teaching methodology as their own, and whether it becomes a natural and important part of them. It also entails consciousness-raising and the extent to which they acquire a sense of ownership of English, as a language belonging to them, rather than something abstract and external. It is important to realize that it cannot be assumed that students will automatically internalize the teaching philosophy while the process of teaching is underway. Whilst learning may seem to be a process that naturally occurs in a teaching program, Offner (1997, 1) says:

> It is sometimes mistakenly assumed that, after years of schooling, each student has already acquired the proper learning skills…many times students simply don't know what they are supposed to do and when they do, they don't know how to go about doing it.

Thus learning and acquisition do not necessarily follow the imposition of methodology and materials. The syllabus philosophy also needs to be understood, perceived as beneficial and accepted to be internalized. Students need to understand and accept *why* they learn English *in the manner* they do. If the students could perceive how, and agree with the reasons why the philosophy and methodology are applied, they would have a clearer perspective of the purpose of learning to speak English and become more motivated along the way.

THE OWNERSHIP OF ENGLISH

Talebinezhad and Aliakbari (2001, 2) note:

> English is the language of the Industrial Revolution and remains the language of science and technology. More importantly, it is the language of the computer and Internet and is the chief language of tourism all over the world.

EIL refers to the use of English by non-native, as well as native English speakers of different nations as a medium for communication. It transcends national boundaries, and many social groups with distinct traditional languages and ethnic traditions. It started with the beginning of

colonialism around 500 years ago and continues to the present age of globalization. (Smith 1976, Quirk 1978, Alptekin & Alptekin 1984, Stern 1992, Talebinezhad & Aliakbari 2001).

EIL is defined by Suzuki (1999), as English that is free from the cultural and linguistic influence of any one particular country, and which can be used to successfully communicate with other educated native or non-native speakers of English in any country of the world.

The ownership of EIL is closely related to cultural factors. Culture is about social identity where communication plays an important role (Podur, 2002). Culture can have different meanings, for example aesthetic, sociological, semantic and pragmatic (Adaskou, Britten and Fahsi, 1990, p.3). A well-known definition by Wardaugh (1998, 217) views it as:

> …whatever it is one has to know or believe in order to operate in a manner acceptable to its members, and to do so in any role that they accept for any one of themselves.

From a Marxian perspective, culture is part of the "superstructure" of society, and is closely related to the economy, or "base" of society. According to Jorge (1983), the base represents the economic relations of production in society while the superstructure determines the social consciousness, which include all the cultural, social and ideological structures and its institutions such as education, and access to economic wealth is unequal and institutionally sustained in the interests of those in power.

While people identify and communicate with each other for many purposes, it would seem that the main purpose is for the economic sustenance of society. Without an economy to sustain it, it would appear that language, society and culture could have no foundation, or purpose, to exist (Strickland, 2002). The role of EIL, and EFL, is therefore significant in terms of national as well as global economic relations and subsistence. Moreover, it is relevant to survival in particular (Jeffrey, 2005). EIL, as part of the colonial infrastructure, sustained unbalanced shares of economic wealth and harmful international relationships historically (Mabogunje 1980, Kaplan 1987, Phillipson 1992, Holliday 1994, Tully 1997). In addition, EIL still continues to marginalize minority cultures and destroy their indigenous languages (Friere 1972, Abbott 1992, Tully 1997, Wurm 2001). Skutnabb-Kangas (1999, 2) states that only 10 percent of the approximately 6 800 languages left in the world will exist in 100 years time, and:

> …the media and the educational systems are the most important direct agents in language murder today; indirectly the culprits are the global economic and political systems.

It also appears to some that it is currently America and native English-speaking countries of the West that primarily benefit from globalization, and that much of ESL and EFL that promotes EIL is a part of such globalization should be referred to as 'Americanization' or 'Westernization'. According to this perspective, globalization is oppressive along with EIL, resulting in social and economic divisions in the interests of the developed countries which are predominantly native English-Speaking (Hoogvelt, 1997 and Castells, 1996).

However, it is suggested in this paper that there is fundamental change in EIL that is potentially transforming English to a language that can assist in improving socio-economic relationships. For example, in the ex-colonial and non-native English speaking countries of Nigeria (Omodiaogbe, 1992 and Bisong, 1995), the Philippines (Agana, 1998) and Singapore (Abbott, 1992), people are adopting English, and taking ownership of it. This is an important turning point in the evolution of EIL. This is an important turning point in the evolution of EIL. In fact, one can go to most countries in the world and get by on English, even though it is not spoken as a first language such as the EU, Russia, China, Korea or South America (however, this is not the case in Japan, as Japan is unique in terms of being an ultra-low English proficiency country).

English in these countries appears to no longer be imposed from the outside but rather as something that has become a part of the national culture. In this way, the depleting cultural and economic nature of EIL is being eroded and replaced by a potentially replenishing one for its former victims, who are taking ownership of English.

Non-native speakers of English now represent more than two-thirds of English speakers in the world (Crystal, 1997). Contemporary globalization also no longer renders any sense in differentiating native and non-native speakers of English, given that more exchanges take place between non-native speakers of English than between non-native and native speakers of English (Walker, 2001).

Thus, the traditional concept of "authentic" English within the framework of EIL has become problematic and outdated in that English now represents the words and cultures of many nations that are non-native English-speaking (Kramsch and Sullivan, 1996). English no longer belongs to any particular group of people, and non-native speakers are no longer mere consumers of the Western-Anglo-Saxon tradition. This notion does not only apply to EIL but to Chinese which is also a widely spoken language and will play a much larger global role, perhaps surpassing EIL and become known as Chinese as an International Language or CIL, as the economy of China becomes stronger and stronger and increases its international influence.

THE NEED FOR OWNERSHIP OF ENGLISH IN JAPAN

Japan avoided the historically repressive impact of EIL. It was never colonized, and only subjected to a brief American occupation following the Second World War. Despite Japan being the world's second-largest economy at present and one of the largest markets for EFL teaching in the world, the bulk of the Japanese population is not fluent in English.

It has been argued that this is primarily the consequence of geographical and historical influences. The Japanese have been isolated, both through being an island and through three centuries of government-imposed isolation. Despite being the first Asian country to adopt Western science and technology, the partnership did not sustain a mutual exchange of cultural values. This relegated foreign language education to relative insignificance (Koike, 2002).

Japan is experiencing economic difficulties that have persisted since the bursting of the 'bubble economy' a decade ago, with unprecedented post-war unemployment rates, and a general societal malaise (Ellington, 1999 and Matanle, 2001). The adverse economic situation is spilling

over into social dissatisfaction with the educational system (Ellington, 2001). The above suggests a need for Japan to find innovative ways to face global challenges, especially given the rapid economic growth of its neighbor China, and part of this could be the need to find ways of taking ownership of English. According to Hadley (2002, 1):

> … more of Japan's citizens will need to acquire a greater level of proficiency in the English language, if Japan is to maintain its place as the world's second largest economy.

This is because Kaplan (1987, 144) indicates that the consequence of successful globalization:

> … is significantly tied to the availability of English because, for better or for worse, English is the language of science and technology.

It is understandable that many Japanese might well consider their homogeneous culture, language and national identity to be under attack from the forces of globalization and EIL. As Shishin (2002, 1) mentions:

> Japan has a long fascination and delight with things foreign. It has an equally long history of suspicion of foreign influences and foreigners themselves. This contradiction extends into every facet of Japanese life. It is significantly present in Japanese education.

Therefore, taking ownership of English in Japan, should involve the addition of English alongside Japanese, as a means of increasing real (rather than realistic) communication internationally, as a basis of sustaining a strong Japanese economy. It should not imply a simultaneous sacrifice of Japanese culture, language and national identity as many Japanese fear. It is important to aim towards additive bilingualism, in that it wants its students to develop a comprehensible proficiency in spoken English without reduction or displacement of their cultural values or their primary language Japanese.

DE-MOTIVATION AS A BARRIER TO CONSCIOUSNESS-RAISING, INTERNALIZATION AND OWNERSHIP

De-motivation is currently one of the greatest barriers to Japanese students internalizing and taking ownership of EIL through consciousness-raising. To understand this more clearly it is important to consider what motivation is in the first place.

Attitude is important because it affects students' motivation towards learning. Attitude relates to sets of beliefs about language learning, the target culture, their culture, the teacher and the learning task.

Norris-Holt (2001, 1), referring to Crookes and Schmidt (1991), defines motivation as:

> …the learner's orientation with regard to the goal of learning a second language.

Motivation is also described as the impetus to create and sustain intentions and goal seeking acts (Ames and Ames, 1989). Motivation is related to attitude and *vice versa*, and both have an influence on learning and acquisition. Thus, they are also prerequisites for internalization and ownership, and for consciousness-raising to play a role in it.

Gardner's socio-educational model (1982) is unique in that it looks expressly at second language acquisition in the classroom. Three aspects of student motivation are highlighted in the model: effort (time and drive), desire (extent of language proficiency wished for) and effect (emotional reactions to language study). In an earlier study, Gardner and Lambert (1972, 132) highlighted "integrative motivation" which stresses "a sincere and personal interest in the people and culture represented by the other group" and "instrumental motivation" which stresses "the practical value and advantages of learning a new language".

Integrative motivation is the desire on the part of the student to feel an affinity with the people, the society and the culture of the language that is learned, and is usually referred to in the context of living in the target language community (Falk 1978, and Finegan, 1999). Instrumental motivation, on the other hand, concerns the practical and concrete rewards that student's desire (Hudson, 2000). This relates to achievement purposes such as passing an exam or getting a degree. A student's opinion of a given language is significantly shaped by its perceived usefulness and relevance to future career goals (Chambers, 1999).

WHY IS MOTIVATION LACKING IN JAPAN?

Norris-Holt (2001, 2) notes difficulties in applying the term "integrative" in a monoculture society like Japan. Indeed, Benson (1991) had difficulty using the terms integrative and instrumental among Japanese students. He made a third group and called it "personal", for example "pleasure at being able to read English, and enjoyment of entertainment in English" (Benson, 1991, p.36 cited in Norris-Holt, 2001, 2). While Benson was able to find integrative and personal reasons in a limited sense, he could not find instrumental motivation. Norris-Holt (2001, 4), says:

> Benson suggests that the student's rejection of instrumental motivation illustrates the view that students do not perceive English as having a vital role to play in their lives. He also makes the point that the rejection of instrumental reasons for the study of English may indicate that the Japanese language is considered adequate for normal daily verbal exchange.

High dropout and absentee rates are becoming common among the current student generation in universities and colleges throughout Japan because of a general apathy and world-weariness (McVeigh, 2001 and Burden, 2002). This lack of integrative and instrumental motivation stands in the way of the chances of Japan to take ownership of EIL and to keep its strong position in the world economy.

Part of the reason is that high school English activities are geared towards preparing students for the university entrance examinations. The entrance examinations are not aimed at assessing the speaking and listening skills, but grammar and reading skills.

As Norris-Holt (2001, 3) says:

> Certainly, a high percentage of both junior and senior high school students identify the major reason for English study as a necessity for achievement in examinations.

Learning merely grammar and reading, without conversational skills, is de-motivational, and becomes fairly deeply ingrained after six years. Their attitude of English as something unpleasant has become difficult to reverse once they become young adults.

Also, university life in Japan is generally accepted as a peaceful and relaxing respite between high school and working life, and the future of students is not primarily determined by academic performance, as Wright (1997, 2) points out:

> A student's future position in society is decided by the name of the school from which they graduate, not by the grades they attained there. Successful socialization and the development of a well-rounded member of society are the goals of college life, not academic rigor.

In addition, Nonaka (2002, 1) says:

> In Japan, children study so hard to pass the entrance examinations for the universities they want to attend that the problem of *gakureki shakai* arises -- where greater value is placed on the name of the university than on the student's real ability. This kind of value system produces lazy students to some degree.

Thus, with no more university entrance exam to study for, and no sense of academic challenge, many university students lose academic direction (Norris-Holt, 2001). This further erodes motivation.

It is also important to consider the role of transfer with regard to motivation, internalization and ownership. Brunner (1960, 31) says:

> The best way to create interest in a subject is to render it worth knowing, which means to make the knowledge gained usable in one's thinking beyond the situation in which learning has occurred.

Transfer is the application of prior knowledge to fresh learning circumstances (McKeough, 1995), and is frequently viewed as the learning purpose, and the degree to which it takes place is a measure of accomplishment (Pea, 1987 and Perkins, 1991). Ngeow (1998, 1) says:

> Research suggests that transfer and motivation are mutually supportive in creating an optimal learning environment. If the learner perceives what he is learning to be relevant and transferable to other situations, he will find learning meaningful, and his motivation to acquire the skill or knowledge will increase.

For transfer to take place, the student must be motivated to do two things: firstly, recognize opportunities for transfer, and secondly, possess motivation to take advantage of recognized opportunities (Prawat, 1989). Yet, Gray (1999, 45) says:

> The bald fact is that most students are only taking English classes because they are required to, many have no real interest in really learning it …and they are acutely aware that they will never use English outside the classroom.

While ministry officials, politicians and business leaders have been calling for years for the creation of programs to produce a creative workforce that is globally minded and fluent in English (Tanaka, 1996; Daily Yomiyuri, 1996) the reality is that, in Japan, English is only significant in the domain of education (Hadley, 1997). Even in the multinational companies of Tokyo, English is restricted to e-mail, faxes and letters (Kirkwold, et al, 1995).

The lack of academic direction and transfer opportunities, combined with rising unemployment, has led to a rise in social problems among students, who have been described by Roche (1999, 23) as:

> …dyeing their hair yellow, wearing rings in their noses and crying into Kirins on the fringes of society.

Also, Andrew Crooks (2005, 1) says:

> Japanese students end up wondering what they are studying for when they are 18 to 25, because they didn't develop a sense of purpose 10 years earlier.

These problems also affect students psychologically, especially through stress and anxiety. Prior experience with foreign language instruction in a classroom environment affects a learner's desire to study foreign languages in the future (Chambers, 1999). Once a student has become de-motivated, it is difficult to reverse. This is because anxiety replaces motivation.

Moreover, motivation and the filtering process are closely related which in turn impacts on consciousness-raising. As Finchpark (2002, 9) notes:

> Learners do not attend to all the input they receive. They attend to some features, and 'filter' other features out. This often depends on affective factors such as motivation, attitudes, emotions and anxiety.

While a low filter has little anxiety and contributes to higher levels of comprehension and attention, a high filter is full of anxiety that causes students to develop psychological barriers to learning (LeLoup, 2000). Therefore, a high level of stress or anxiety will severely restrict the chances of consciousness-raising from taking hold as a learning tool.

Anxiety can be debilitative or facilitative, depending on its quantity (Alpert and Haber, 1960). Student stress and anxiety is often debilitative having a negative affect on learning English and for consciousness-raising to work (Naimon, Frohlich, Stern and Todesco, 1978). Anxiety plays a

subtle role and can often go unnoticed, yet is a barrier to student success in communication activities (Balili, 2002). Correlations exist between high anxiety and low scores, according to Pimsleur, Mosberg and Morrison (1962), and noted by Hadley (1994). Situations perceived as threatening, such as authoritarian teachers (Lazarus and Folkman, 1985) or lack of student confidence (Bandura, 1977) are significant contributors to stress and anxiety and destroyers of consciousness-raising.

Studies tend to agree that sincerity and openness between teachers and students are important contributors towards motivation (Niederhauser, 1997). Dornyei (2001, 116) cited in Thanasoulas (2002, 1) notes:

> …teacher skills in motivating learners should be seen as central to teaching effectiveness.

Given the low levels of student motivation in Japan, and the reasons for it, teachers shoulder much responsibility, as they are required to play a very important role in motivation. Teachers need to convey enthusiasm to minimize the potential psychological distance and the propensity for students to create mental barriers between themselves and the target language as well as its culture. Teachers have to walk a fine line on keeping a class disciplined whilst keeping the students motivated and interested in the subject enough for consciousness-raising to take hold. This is no easy task and often takes years to refine.

However, teachers need to be motivated in order to motivate students. Just as student stress is easily overlooked, teacher stress can be easily overlooked, as foreign teachers in Japan are often reluctant to speak openly about their opinions for fear of being penalized. However, a de-motivated teacher will considerably exacerbate the stress and negative attitude of the students; further exacerbating their de-motivation and apathy towards English.

Martin (2002) notes that English language courses should primarily take the needs of students as well as that of other stakeholders in the academic community into consideration. It should be noted that Martin is a Philippine English professor based in the Philippines. She believes teachers should not merely beneficiaries of ELT, but should *also be active partners in the process*. This is considered important for teacher motivation, which is in turn important for student motivation. It is very hard for a teacher to hide inner feelings of anxiety and anguish, as they are merely people like any other, but the students can see beyond their artificial exteriors, their smiles and their laughter, and this subsequently further dampens their motivation as well as that of the students.

Hence, Shimizu (2000, 1) states

> Since I began teaching in Japan nine years ago, I have always felt that students viewed me more as an entertainer than a teacher

Certainly, there are many English teachers who do intend to teach in Japan for a short period (perhaps a year or two) and then teach in another country or return home. However there are also English teachers who consider their teaching a serious profession and would like to live and

work in Japan for the long haul. It is a great loss to Japan when stable and professional teachers decide to leave Japan. Given this unfortunate situation, it is extremely difficult to promote internalization and ownership of EIL, but it is important for a teacher not to become apathetic and alienated, thus the following is one possible way of striving in a positive direction through the use of consciousness-raising.

A TEACHING CONSCIOUSNESS-RAISING PHILOSOPHY TO PROMOTE INTERNALIZATION AND OWNERSHIP

There are a number of values and assumptions that together form the guiding principles of any syllabus, and these guide us as teachers to structure our classes in certain ways. Guiding principles relate to the system of ideas, beliefs and values, and could also be referred to as the approach, or the philosophy, of a syllabus.

These ideas, beliefs and values also underline the teaching methodology, which organizes how and what is taught. A teaching methodology is a collection of procedures exhibiting a perspective of language teaching (Boggles World's glossary of ESL terms, 2002). Among such ideas, beliefs and values in an English Language Teaching (ELT) program should ideally be the promotion of EIL ownership and its internalization among students.

To take ownership of EIL and internalize this philosophy, students need to understand and accept the philosophy and perceive English as something belonging to them that they can use, rather than as something external that they learn about. For this to happen, students need to perceive that they can both approve and benefit from the way English is taught, and express a wish to transfer their skills after one year in Freshman English. Motivation is therefore also an important consideration in regards to ownership and philosophical internalization. Ownership and internalization are thus ideals towards which students could strive, but the extent of success in this respect is difficult to gauge. The students may be friendly and cooperative, and may seem to enjoy their classes, but it is difficult to tell if ownership and internalization are taking place.

The nature of a teaching approach is also bound to have an impact on internalization, ownership and motivation, as Stern (1992, 24) explains:

> Some methods imply a specific teaching approach. For example, in an audio-lingual program the teacher is firmly in command, directing the class step by step in a benevolent but authoritarian manner. This view of teaching is in contrast to an approach in which the teacher and students are viewed as participants in a joint enterprise, democratically negotiating with each other about what to learn and how to learn it.

Similarly, White (1988) distinguishes between Type A and Type B syllabuses. He refers to Type A syllabuses as focusing on the *what* is to be learned and the Type B syllabus as focusing on the *how* it is to be learned. As White (1988, 91) says:

> What Type A syllabuses have in common is a basis in content. In this respect they conform to the traditional definition of a syllabus as an organized statement of content of things to be learnt.

On the other hand, White (1988, 94) refers to a Type B syllabus as:

> …a move…from content to process of learning and procedures of teaching – in other words, to methodology.

These paradigms are similar to those of Wilkins (1976, 2-13), who referred to "synthetic" and "analytic" syllabuses. There is much support for Type B syllabuses in ELT literature. For example, Ngeow (1998, 3) says that students can be motivated by:

> … letting them identify and decide for themselves relevant learning goals. This will motivate them to apply what they have learned to attain these learning goals.

Thus Thanasoulas (2002, 4) recommends:

> …to inspire learners to concern themselves with most learning activities, we should find out their goals and the topics they want to learn, and try to incorporate them into the curriculum.

Many approaches claim to be Type B but lean towards a one-way flow of information with little consultation with students (Johnson, 1989). Conversely, some do not do not claim to be student-centered and are deliberately highly structured through intricate administrative networking and interconnections.

One reason for the highly structured nature of some approaches is the desire for tangibility within the highly structured education and wider society of Japan, and this makes it become as coordinated, structured and consistent as possible. However, it would seem that the main reason as to why most syllabi lean towards Type A to get very students to talk in the first place. Whilst this may be appropriate, given the circumstances, it could be beneficial to consider and experiment with possible alternatives, especially in regards to being more student-centered in nature.

The philosophy of consciousness-raising, internalization and ownership of EIL may appear fairly straightforward to a teacher, but it is beyond the comprehension of an average 18-year-old Japanese student who has only experienced grammar drilling based approaches before entering university. Perhaps these make them see English as something to be administered, rather than that which should grow from within (as does ownership and internalization). If the students are told about the philosophy, many seem to forget. When they are shown how the guiding principles apply to practice, it is possible that some may remember. However, if they are involved in the formulation of the guiding principles, their understanding would increase, and so too, their ownership and internalization. The following is a way in which consciousness-raising could be used to promote internalization and ownership.

Most approach to teaching in English aims to maximize communicative opportunity and is in an attempt to teach the skills necessary to acquire the language with each step performing a consciousness-raising function. This is similar to the PPP approach (**p**reparation, then **p**ractice, then **p**erformance) in the sequencing of activities. Finchpark (2002, 4) describes the PPP approach as:

> …teaching the micro skills first (e.g. grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure), before asking the learners to use the language (communication). The focus is on the various components of the language first. Students then have to fit these together in comprehending or producing language.

For consciousness-raising to be maximized, homework should be the preparation, listening activities the practice, with conversation activities the performance.

Despite the popularity of the PPP approach, Ranalli (2001) draws attention to criticism of it as being an unnatural learning approach that ignores the natural order of acquisition and its undue stress on productive practice. Ranalli's criticism may hold for very motivated and proactive students. However, many students are extremely passive and need to be helped in a step-by-step way of raising their consciousness to the forms that can be used in conversation. This could be appropriate as a means of bridging the gap between accuracy and fluency among extremely passive students.

It is a way of structuring the learning process so that students can most effectively grasp matters, and also concerns how activities are sequenced so that students can observe salient forms and build on them. This is because learning is not an isolated process because languages are extensive and comprehensive. Learning is rather a process of adding new information to existing understanding, so that students can relate to what they already know.

Homework as the Foundation of Consciousness-Raising

Homework is the consciousness-raising foundation upon which all other activities in classes should hinge because it draws attention to new vocabulary and language forms that will be relied on in the listening and conversation activities that follow. The homework assignments keep the students focused, extrinsically motivated, and prepared for each day's lesson. As Skehan (1998, 48) mentions, 'the more frequent a form, the more likely it is to be noticed and then become integrated into the language system'. Homework serves this purpose.

A little homework should be regularly assigned as pre-task activities usually from the grammar check tasks or from the writing units of the textbook, and then checking can be done at the start of the following day. It should usually not take more than fifteen minutes for the students to complete at home. Homework should usually a grammar-focus exercise coupled with a written exercise (usually by matching, or filling in missing words, such as information-gap tasks). It can sometimes concern the learning of new words from the vocabulary sections of the textbook, and a short test could be given at the start of the next class to check if students can remember the words, or if students can use them in sentences to enhance their awareness of them.

Homework should always chosen that will draw the students' attention to new forms of grammar, new vocabulary and typical expressions that will be used in conversation exercises with their classmates the next day (in personal contexts). It is important to note that the grammar homework needs to focus on the communicative context to enhance the raising of consciousness through attention to form that can be easily related to practical conversational use.

Homework is where the retention and cognitive organization of prominent language detail begin. These then become more embedded in the minds of the students with listening and conversation practice the next day. This in turn lays the foundation upon which further knowledge is added in the future.

Students who do not do the homework are not able to cope adequately with the listening and speaking activities the next day in the classroom. Homework ensures that the students undergo their learning activities with the necessary seriousness, which in turn allows for consciousness-raising, and ultimately internalization and ownership, to take hold.

Listening and Conversation as the Manifestations of Consciousness-Raising

Consciousness-raising is strived for through ensuring that, as far as possible, there is a link between grammatical form (done at home) and conversation (in the classroom). It is accepted that the students will never gain conversational proficiency by merely studying the rules of sentence construction, but by using what they have gained through focusing on grammatical forms in practical conversation where it is most needed, they are engaged in a process consciousness-raising that will yield results at some future time. Thus homework checking in the classroom only takes a short time, listening activities a little longer, and the remaining time should be devoted to fluency-based conversational activities. The efforts students make to be comprehensible in their conversation activities are believed to facilitate acquisition where they apply what they have consciously learnt before.

Listening activities aim at reinforcing the link between what has already been drawn to their attention through focus on grammatical form for homework, and is also a good bridge between the homework and the conversational activities that follow. Listening activities are the interface between grammar and lexis where students listen for gist (through extracting main ideas or information) as well as for detail. Video activities are sometimes added to the CD activities to help bridge the gap between the classroom and the real world.

Listening activities serve as a refresher and a warm-up, and assist in getting the students to use the grammatical forms to some extent in their conversations. However, the listening exercises are covered quickly to afford students to make the most opportunity of the conversation activities, and benefit from them. If the listening activities take too long, the students begin to forget the forms that they learned for homework, and hence cannot apply them adequately in the conversation activities. This is important for a fuller impact of consciousness-raising.

Unrehearsed and largely unfettered conversational activities should constitute the bulk of classroom time, and the teacher should act mainly as facilitator by preparing the students for conversational activities and then letting them get on with it. The themes remain the same as

they were for homework. For example, if the homework was on the topic of fashion, then so would both the listening and the conversation activities be on fashion. This is done in a step-by-step way to maximize consciousness-raising.

The students can also circulated among each other in small groups so that they get maximum contact with each other during the conversation activities. The teacher can, for example, give them a topic to talk about, not all of a sudden, but rather the process will be staggered. It could begin with the students perhaps writing down a couple of thoughts to aid the thinking process, and then talking about it. At first, they could be rather passive, but after talking on the same topic with more partners the conversations they become more and more active, and they seem to enjoy it more.

Students need to be encouraged to personalize what they are learning, through expressing their own ideas and opinions as much as possible. Students should be encouraged to use the grammatical regularities that they covered in homework. In this way, co-operative learning (and the discouragement of competition which induces stress) is promoted as a form of consciousness-raising, where students are encouraged to share their knowledge. Also, while the students are practicing conversation topics in the classroom, they must be constantly rotated into different groups, so that they get as much experience as possible in speaking to different classmates.

In conversational activities, students need to be encouraged to place most emphasis on fluency (as opposed to accuracy), and conversational content and strategy, as well as physical gestures and eye contact play important roles. Students are taught how to open and close conversations, introduce and develop topics, and understand and use common useful expressions as well as idiomatic phrases. They need to be reminded often that they do not have to understand every word they encounter, just as it is in the real life situation, and they are encouraged to guess its meaning from the context of the situation. Throughout all these activities it is vital to remind students to be proud of the way they speak English, as there are many ways of speaking English internationally, such as Filipino-English, Chinese-English and so on. It is felt that this also aids consciousness-raising.

Speaking Tests as the Culmination of Consciousness-Raising

The consciousness-raising process should therefore start with homework, manifest itself in the listening and conversation activities, and culminate with the speaking tests. Other tests can be given but the speaking tests are especially important if the approach is communicative.

In the speaking tests the students should be expected to show that they can recall and use forms of speech related to the topics covered in the past few weeks, and couple them with their own insights in communication, and to see if a process of consciousness-raising is working.

On the day of the speaking quiz, three students could be randomly chosen, enter the testing room and sit facing each other at a table. They could choose one quiz question from a set of quiz questions that are written on cards and placed face down on the table. The students talk about this question in English with each other for three minutes. Each of the three students can then be

given a grade. After the three minutes are up, a new group of students is called to the room, and the process continues until all the students have been tested.

These tests are important consciousness-raisers as they give a definite purpose for homework and classroom activities, and thereby ensure that students undergo their consciousness-raising activities with the necessary seriousness.

A larger portion of the grade can allocated to the 'content of conversation' and to the 'communication strategies', rather than to 'grammar and vocabulary', and 'pronunciation'. 'Content of conversation' relates to the ability to converse on a topic with some detail or reasons for opinions. 'Communication strategies' relate to starting conversations, responding to questions, asking for more information, and closing a conversation, and also includes gestures and eye contact. Again, this relates to real English, as opposed to realistic English.

Fluency is thereby given greater importance than accuracy. In this way, students can be encouraged to make meaningful (or real) conversation a skill, while their attention to grammatical form is in the process of unfolding at a slower pace and at a largely unconscious level. They should not be afraid, or penalized, for making grammatical mistakes, nor should the teacher overload them with expectations. The speaking test should be a happy activity for students to explore with what they have learned and acquired.

Knowing that they will be tested a week or two later on the same subject matter, and knowing that their homework will not only be checked the next day, but will also enable them to converse more in the classroom the next day and thereby enable them to acquire more participation points, the students pay a lot more serious attention to the forms of grammatical structures as preparation than we believe they otherwise would. This would assist in consciousness-raising playing as large a role as possible.

CONCLUSION

The frequency of classes, the variety and nature of the texts, daily homework on grammar forms, listening and conversation exercises in the classrooms, practicing the grammar forms in personal ways, and the build up to the speaking tests all contribute to the unfolding of consciousness-raising and ultimately to internalization and ownership. This is especially so if homework is the preparation, listening activities the practice and conversation the performance. This way of sequencing activities facilitates consciousness-raising by allowing awareness of language forms to manifest naturally in the acquisition process. These complement each other in order to allow consciousness-raising to unfold. I feel that teachers should be constantly aware of consciousness-raising, and to use it to promote internalization and ownership.

I have come to realize the importance and challenge of encouraging students through consciousness-raising to internalize the syllabus philosophy and to take ownership of EIL. Motivation seems to be the key to success in this regard. Without adequate student motivation, it is hard to achieve much else, and this is true of any teaching situation. Ongoing research and experimentation in such aspects is necessary for the continued improvement of teaching styles. The mere assumption that internalization and ownership will take place on their own accord is

only something realized in the amount of considerable effort and application it takes to do so, and consciousness-raising is the key. I have also realized however that, no matter how hard the effort, it is impossible to always achieve success in this direction to any great degree. I used to believe that one could change the attitude of a whole class, but if one can make a change to at least one in twenty students the task is certainly worthwhile.

References

Abbott, G. (1992). 'Development, Education, and English Language Teaching'. *ELT Journal* 46/2: 172-178.

Adaskou, K., Britten, D and Fahsi, B. (1990). 'Design Decisions on the Cultural Contentof a Secondary English Course for Morocco'. *ELT Journa*l 44/1: 3-10.

Agana, R. J. P. (1998). *Pilipino and English: A Brief Historical and Sociolinguistic Analysis.* Retrieved April 20 from http://www.angelfire.com/ak/RJPADirectory/ecolinguistics.html.

Alpert, R., and Haber, R. (1960). 'Anxiety in Academic Situations'. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 61: 207-215.

Alptekin, C. and Alptekin, M. (1984). 'The Question of Culture: EFL Teaching in Non-English Speaking Countries'. *ELT Journa*l 38/1: 14-20.

Ames, C., and Ames, R. (1989). *Research in Motivation in Education*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Balili, J. B. (2002). 'Language Anxiety: Its Effect on the Oral Performance In English College Freshmen'. *Paper presented to The Linguistic Society of the Philippines InternationalConference*, Manila December 9-11, 2002.

Bandura, A. (1977). 'Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change'. *Psychological Review* 84: 191-215.

Benson, M. J. (1991). 'Attitudes and Motivation Towards English: a Survey of Japanese Freshmen'. *RELC Journal* 22/1: 34-48.

Bisong, J. (1995). 'Language Choice and Cultural Imperialism: a Nigerian Perspective.' *ELT Journal* 49/2: 122-132.

Boggles World's Glossary of ESL Terms (2001). Retrieved June 20 from http://bogglesworld.com/glossary.htm.

Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The Process of Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.

Burden, P. (2002). 'A Cross Sectional Study of Attitudes and Manifestations of Apathy of University Students Towards Studying English'. *ELT Journal* 26/3: 3-10.

Cambridge International Dictionary of English (2002). Retrieved August 10th from http://dictionary.cambridge.org/.

Chambers, G. N. (1999). *Motivating Language Learners*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Castells, M. (1996). *End of the Millennium*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Cavour, I. (2002). 'Use of Implicit and/or Explicit Strategy Teaching in the Language Classroom'. *Paper Presented to The Linguistic Society of the Philippines International Conference,* Manila December 9-11, 2002.

Crooks, A. S. (2002, October 9). *Motivating Youth A Tough Challenge*, Japan Times Retrieved October 13 2005 from http://www.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/getarticle.pl5?rc20051009a1.htm

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Daily Yomiyuri (1996) 'White Paper: Universities should be Diverse and Unique'.

Dornyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Motivation.* England: Pearson Education Limited.

Ellington, L. (1999). 'Learning from the Japanese Economy'. *National Clearing House for US-Japan Studies, Indiana University*. Retrieved September 25th 2005 from http://www.indiana.edu/~japan/digest15.html.

Ellington, L. (2001). 'Japanese Education'. *National Clearing House for US-Japan Studies, Indiana University*. Retrieved September 25th 2005 from http://www.indiana.edu/~japan/digest5.html.

Ellis, R. (1992). *Second Language Acquisition in Language Pedagogy*. Oxford University Press.

Falk, J. (1978). *Linguistics and Language: A Survey of Basic Concepts and Implications*. John Wiley and Sons.

Finchpark Glossary of Basic Terms in TEFL Studies (2002). Retrieved November 12th 2002 from http://www.finchpark.com/courses/bglossary.htm.
Finegan, E. (1999). *Language: Its Structure and Use.* Harcourt Brace.

Friere, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.

Gardner, R. C. (1982). 'Language Attitudes and Language Learning'. In Bouchard, R. E. and

Gardner, R. and Lambert, W. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivations in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Giles, H. (eds.) *Attitudes Towards Language Variation*. Edward Arnold, pp. 132-147.

Gray, R. (1999). *Confucian Conundrums: Higher Education and ESL Teaching in Korea and Japan*. Proceedings of the 1998 Korea TESOL Conference, March 1999.

Hadley, G. (1994). 'English and Student Anxiety'. *The Japanese Journal of Nursing Education* 35/7: 539-543.

Hadley, G. (1997). 'A Survey of Cultural Influence in Japanese in Japanese ELT'. *Bulletin of Keiwa College* 6: 61-87.

Hadley, G. (2002). 'Relating the Curriculum to Regional Concerns: A Japanese Case Study'. *Paper presented at RELC 37th Annual International Seminar, Singapore.* Retrieved January 16th 2004 from http://www.nuis.ac.jp/~hadley/publication/relcpresent/regionalcurriculum.htm.

Holliday, A. (1994). 'The House of TESEP'. *ELT Journal* 48/1: 3-11.

Hoogvelt, A. (1997). *Globalization and the Postcolonial World*. Macmillan Press.

Hudson, G. (2000). *Essential Introductory Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishers.

Jeffrey, D. (2004). 'Consciousness-Raising in Freshman English.' *The CELE Journal* Volume 12, Center for English Language Studies, Asia University: 29-42

Jeffrey, D. (2005). 'Towards Internationalization and Ownership of English as an International Language.' *The CELE Journal* Volume 13, Center for English Language Studies, Asia University: 29-42

Johnson, R. K. (1989). 'A Decision-Making Framework for the Coherent Language Curriculum' in Johnson, R. K. (ed.): *The Second Language Curriculum*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-23.

Jorge, L. (1983). 'Base and Superstructure'. In Bottomore, T. et al, (eds.) *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*. Harvard University Press.

Kaplan, R. (1987). 'English in the Language Policy of the Pacific Rim.' *World Englishes* 6/2: 137-148.

Kirkwold, L., Lomas, D. and Yonesaka, S. (1995). 'English Used in Foreign Multinational Companies in the Tokyo Region: a Pilot Study'. *Hokkai Gakuen University: Studies in Culture* 4: 123-174.

Koike, I. (2002). 'English language Education Policy in Japan: A Particular Type of Policy-Making Process'. *Plenary Speech Presented at The Linguistic Society of the Philippines International Conference*, Manila December 9-11, 2002.

Krashen, S. D. (1987). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Prentice-Hall International.

Krashen, S. D. (1988). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Prentice-Hall International.

Kramsch, C and Sullivan, P. (1996). 'Appropriate Pedagogy'. *ELT Journal* 50/3: 199-212.

Lazarus, R. and Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, Appraisal and Coping.* New York: Springer Publishing Company.

LeLoup, J. W. (2000). *Cortland ESL/LEP*. Retrieved October 15th 2005 from http://www.cortland.edu/www/flteach/esl/ESL-Terminology.html.

Mabogunje, A. L. (1980). *The Development Process: a Spatial Perspective*. London: Hutchinson.

Martin, I. P. (2002). 'Language Proficiency Perceptions of Content Teachers: Implications for Curriculum and Instruction'. *Presentation to The Linguistic Society of the Philippines International Conference*, Manila December 9-11, 2002.

Matanle, P. (2001). 'Being In and Of the World: Globalization and Social Change in Contemporary Japan'. *Electronic Journal of Contemporary Japanese Studies.* Retrieved May 13th from http://www.japanesestudies.org.uk/reviews/Matanle.html.

McKeough, A. (1995). *Teaching for Transfer: Fostering Generalization in Learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

McVeigh, B. (2001). 'Higher Education, Apathy and Post-Meritocracy'. *ELT Journal* 25/10: 28-33.

Naimon, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, D. and Todesco, A. (1978). *The Good Language Learner.* Toronto, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Ngeow, K. Y. (1998). 'Motivation and Transfer in Language Learning'. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, English, and Communication, Bloomington, IN*. Retrieved June 17th 2005 from http://www.kidsource.com/education/motivation.lang.learn.html.

Niederhauser, J. (1997). 'Motivating Learners at South Korean Universities'. In *Forum* Vol. 35, number 1, January to March 1997. Retrieved August 25th 2005 from http://exchanges.state.gov/forum/vols/vol35/no1/p8.htm.

Nonaka, M. (2005, September 28). *Self-Motivation: A Tough Choice*, Japan Times Retrieved October 10th 2005 from http://www.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/getarticle.pl5?rc20050928a5.htm

Norris-Holt, J. (2001). 'Motivation as a Contributing Factor in Second Language Acquisition'. *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. VII, No. 6, June 2001 Retrieved February 9th 2002 from http://iteslj.org/Articles/Norris-Motivation.html.

Omodiaogbe, S. A. (1992). '150 Years On: English in the Nigerian School System – Past, Present and Future'. *ELT Journal* 46/1: 19-28.

Offner, M. D. (1997). 'Teaching English Conversation in Japan: Teaching How to Learn'. *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. III, No. 3. Retrieved September 3rd 2003 from http://iteslj.org/Articles/Offner-HowToLearn.html.

Pea, R. D. (1987. 'Socializing the Knowledge Transfer Problem'. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 11, 639-663.

Pearse, R. (1983). 'Realistic and Real English'. In *English Teaching Forum* 21/3: 19-22.

Perkins, D. (1991). 'Educating for Insight'. *Educational Leadership* 49, 4-8.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pimsleur, P., Mosberg, L. and Morrison, A. (1962). 'Student Factors in Foreign Language Teaching'. *Modern Language Journal* 46: 160-170.

Podur, J. (2002). 'Society, Culture, and Communities'. *Znet Institutional Racism Instructional* Retrieved May17th 2003 from http://zmag.org/racewatch/znet_race_instructional.htm.

Prawat, R. S. (1989). 'Promoting Access to Knowledge, Strategy, and Disposition in Students: A research Synthesis'. *Review of Educational Research* 59: 1-41.
Quirk, R. (1978). 'Aspects of English as an International Language'. *Spoglaereren* 9: 15-28.

Ranalli, J. M. (2001). 'Consciousness-Raising Versus Deductive Approaches to Language Instruction: A Study of Learner Preferences'. *Center for English Language Studies, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom*. Retrieved September 14th 2003 from http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/Ranalli1.pdf

Roche, D. (1999). Going Nowhere Fast. *Time Magazine*, August 9
Rost, M., Helgesen, M., Brown, S. and Kahny, J. (2001). *Firsthand Success: Beninners' Course 2*. Longman Asia ELT.

Rutherford, W. E. (1987). *Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching*. Longman.

Shimizu, K (2000) Japanese Student attitudes Towards English Teachers: A Survey. *The Language Teacher,* 19/10: 5-8 Retrieved October 10th 2005 from http://jalt-publications.org/tlt/files/95oct/shimizu.html.

Shishin, A. (2002). The Problems of Xenophobia and the Teaching of English at Japanese Universities, Kobe, Retrieved October 25th 2005 from http://webdoc.gwdg.de/edoc/ia/eese/artic22/shishin/7_2002.html

Skehan, P. (1998). *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford University Press.
Smith, L.E. (1976). 'English as International Auxiliary Language'. *RELC Journal* 7: 1-8.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1999). *Media Development Issue 4*. Retrieved August 18th 2002 from http://www.wacc.org.uk/publications/md/md1999-4/skutnabb_kangas.html.

Stern, H. H. (1992. *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. London: Oxford University Press.

Stevick, E. (1980). *A Way and Ways*. Rowley Mass: Newbury House.
Strickland, R. (2002). English 495: Marxist Theory. *An On-Line Seminar from Illinois State University*. Retrieved December 14th 2003 from http://www.english.ilstu.edu/strickland/495/base.html.

Suzuki, T. (1999). *Nihinjin wa Naze Eigo ga Dekinai ka.* (Why Can't Japanese Speak English?). Tokyo: Iwanami Shinsho.

Talebinezhad, M. R. and Aliakbari, M. (2001). 'Evaluation and Justification of a Paradigm Shift in the Current ELT Models in Iran'. *Linguistik Online* 10, 1/02. Retrieved April 27th 2002 from http://www.linguistik/.

Tanaka, Y. (1996). 'Issues for 1996'. *By the Way Bilingual Journal of U.S.-Japan Relations* 6/1: 1.

Thanasoulas, D. (2002). 'Motivation and Motivating in the Foreign Language Classroom'.*The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. VIII, No. 11 Retrieved January 14th 2004 from http://iteslj.org/Articles/Thanasoulas-Motivation.html.

Tully, M. (1997). 'English: an Advantage to India?' *ELT Journal* 51/2: 157-164.

Walker, R. (2001). 'International Intelligibility'. *English Teaching Professional*, Issue 21, October 2001: 10-13.

Wardaugh, R. (1987). *Languages in Competition: Dominance, Diversity and Decline*. Blackwell.

White, V. W. (1988). *The ELT Curriculum: Design, Innovation and Management*. Blackwell.

Wilkins, D. A. (1976). *Notational Syllabuses*. Oxford University Press.
Willis, D. and Willis, J. (1996). 'Consciousness-raising activities'. In D. and J. Willis (eds.) *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching.* Heinemann.

Wright, M. (1997). 'Japanese Universities and Lifelong Education: Trends and Transitions'. *Paper presented at the Annual Conference of Comparative and International Education Society (Western Region)*, University of Southern California, November 14-15, 1997.

Wurm, S. A. (2001). 'Contact Languages and the Preservation of Endangered Languages.' *Estudios de Sociolinguistica* 2/2: 1-12.